servatory, 18.10 (TWH). SUFFOLK v.c.26. Bury St. Edmunds, 6.10 (RE).

Diachrysia orichalcea Fab. (1). SUSSEX v.c.13. Walberton, 2.9 (J. Radcliff per CRP).

Trichoplusia ni Hubn. (1). DORSET Swanage, 10.10 (BRB).

***Abrostola trigemina** Werneb. (1). HANTS. v.c.11. Hayling Island, 10.7 (JMW). Caught with *M. loreyi*, possibly immigrant.

Catocala fraxini L. (2). HANTS. v.c.10. Freshwater, Isle of Wight, 7.10 (Dr. C. Pope DHS). DORSET Langton Matravers, 9.9, female (E. W. Groves, *Ent. Gaz.* **38**: 58).

***Catocala sponsa** L. (4). DORSET Portland, 11.8 (R. A. Bell per BS). Weymouth, 11.8 (Parker, *Ent. Rec.* **99**:133). HANTS. v.c.11. Hayling Island, 19.8 (JMW). SUSSEX Worthing, 8.8 (Odell *Ent. Rec.* **99**: 132). A woodland species some distance from nearest known places of residence in the New Forest. Possibly immigrants.

SPHEGINA KIMAKOWICZI STROBL (DIPT.: SYRPHIDAE) IN W. KENT AND S. ESSEX. — I was pleased to sweep a male *Sphegina* on 25.vi.86 from a mass of hedge-parsley (its flowers, of course, long over) beside a path in the woods on Shooters Hill near here; it being the first of the genus to be found in the district, and only the second I had ever taken. I supposed it would prove to be the least uncommon of our three species, *clunipes* Fall., but reference to Collin (1937, *Ent. mon.Mag.* 73: 182-5) showed it very clearly to be *S. kimakowiczi* Strobl, which at all events up to 1969 was not known from Kent at all, and even now I am aware of no definite record for the county. However, Stubbs & Falk (1983, *British Hoverflies:* 189) point out that in many districts it is quite as common [!] as *clunipes*. Further, it turns out that the *Sphegina* I had previously taken (Wake Valley, Epping Forest, 16.vii.69) was misidentified at the time as *clunipes* but is actually another male *kimakowiczi*, and I have yet to find the former species.

The sole characters given for the last-named in Stubbs & Falk (*op. cit.:* **94**, 189) are the clear yellow humeri and the slight one of abdominal shape. Should the humeral colour be a little darkened (at least hinted at in my examples) it becomes desirable to make use of other characters. These will be found in Collin's paper cited above and reproduced in Coe's handbook (1953:53), where are illustrated considerable differences in the third antennal segment and the face in profile, between the two species in question; whilst in the position of the outer crossvein, *kimakowiczi* agrees with *verecunda* Coll. and not with *clunipes*, as noted in Collin's key. — A. A ALLEN, 49 Montcalm Road, London SE7.